

BS01299

U.S. Application No. 09/995,648 Art Unit 2131
Response to March 18, 2005 Office Action

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated March 18, 2005, the Assignee respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. The Assignee respectfully submits that the pending claims distinguish over the cited documents.

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (the "Office") rejected claims 1, 7-19, and 22-24 under the judicially-created doctrine of double patenting. Claims 8, 10, 14, 16, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. Claims 1-2, 4, and 7-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Published U.S. Patent Application 2001/0037361 to Croy. Claims 3, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Croy. The Assignee shows, however, that the amended claims are neither obviated nor anticipated by the cited documents. The Assignee thus respectfully submits that the pending claims distinguish over the cited documents.

Examiner's Next Office Action

Examiner Abrishamkar is invited to call Attorney Scott Zimmerman prior to the next office action. As the Examiner and the Attorney discussed on the phone, the Attorney will work with the Examiner to obtain a Notice of Allowance (and thus an Examiner's count) with the next office action. Scott Zimmerman may be reached at (919) 387-6907.

Double-Patenting Rejection

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (the "Office") rejected claims 1, 7-19, and 22-24 under the judicially-created doctrine of double patenting. These claims, however, have been amended and do not resemble the pending claims of U.S. Application 09/916,330. The Assignee thus believes the provisional double-patenting rejection is now moot.

Use of "Oracle" in the Specification

BS01299

U.S. Application No. 09/995,648 Art Unit 2131
Response to March 18, 2005 Office Action

As the Examiner notes, the specification uses the term "oracle" without proper designation as a trademark. The Assignee herein amends paragraphs [0013] and [0015] to recite the proper use of the trademark "ORACLE®." Examiner Abrishamkar is thanked for noting this issue.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 8, 10, 14, 16, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. These claims, however, have been amended, and their current version conforms to the patent laws. The rejection is thus moot.

Rejection of Claims 1-2, 4, and 7-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 4, and 7-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Published U.S. Patent Application 2001/0037361 to Croy. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element is found in a single prior art reference. *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q. 2d (BNA) 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). *See also* DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE, § 2131 (orig. 8th Edition) (hereinafter "M.P.E.P."). As the Assignee shows, the amended claims patentably distinguish over *Croy*. The reference to *Croy* does not anticipate the claims, so the Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner Abrishamkar to remove the 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) rejection.

These claims have been amended. These claims describe stored validation rules. The validation rules comprise at least three hierarchically organized views, with each view utilizing an execution sequence of validation methods. Amended claim 1, for example, is reproduced below.

1. (Currently Amended) A client-server computer system for use with web-based applications comprising:

BS01299

U.S. Application No. 09/995,648 Art Unit 2131
Response to March 18, 2005 Office Action

a computer system running one or more web browsers capable of processing web forms;
a web server capable of processing Java code and web-based forms;
a storage mechanism coupled to said computer system, wherein said web server is used for validating data with information compiled from said storage mechanism; and
validation rules stored in said storage mechanism, the validation rules comprising at least three hierarchically organized views, with each view utilizing an execution sequence of validation methods.

Independent claims 12, 22, and 23 recite similar features.

The published application to *Croy* does not anticipate the claims. *Croy* is completely silent to "validation rules compris[ing] at least three hierarchically organized views, with each view utilizing an execution sequence of validation methods." *Croy* fails to teach or suggest "at least three hierarchically organized views" of validation rules. *Croy* also fails to teach or suggest "each view utilizing an execution sequence of validation methods." Because *Croy* is silent to such features, the patent to *Croy* cannot anticipate the claims. The Assignee, then, respectfully requests that Examiner Abrishamkar remove the § 102 rejection.

Rejection of Claims 31-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e)

Claims 31-35 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Published U.S. Patent Application 2001/0037361 to *Croy*. Claims 31-35, however, have been canceled, so the rejection is moot with respect to these claims.

Rejection of Claims 3, 5, & 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 3, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Croy*. If the Office wishes to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three criteria must be met: 1) combining prior art requires "some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill"; 2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and 3) all the claimed limitations

BS01299

U.S. Application No. 09/995,648 Art Unit 2131
Response to March 18, 2005 Office Action

must be taught or suggested by the prior art. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE, § 2143 (orig. 8th Edition) (hereinafter "M.P.E.P.").

Claims 3, 5, and 6 are not obvious. These claims are dependent upon their respective base claims and, therefore, incorporate the same distinguishing features. Moreover, claims 3, 5, and 6 each recite additional features that are not taught or suggested by *Croy*. Claim 3, for example, recites the "data to be validated is sorted according to a highest priority view." Claim 5 recites "if the data to be validated does not contain an entry matching the highest priority view, then the data is sorted according to a second-highest priority view." Claim 6 recites "if the data to be validated does not contain an entry matching the second-highest priority view, then the data is sorted according to generic validation functions." Because *Croy* fails to teach or suggest these features, one of ordinary skill in the art would not consider these claims obvious over *Croy*. The Assignee thus respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be removed.

If any questions arise, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned at (919) 387-6907 or scott@scottzimmerman.com.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott P. Zimmerman
Attorney for the Assignee
Reg. No. 41,390